

Structures of q -Deformed Currents

Jian-zu Zhang^{a,b,§}

^a Institute for Theoretical Physics, Box 316, East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai 200237, P. R. China

^b Department of Physics, University of Kaiserslautern, PO Box 3049, D-67653 Kaiserslautern, Germany

Abstract

The non-perturbation and perturbation structures of the q -deformed probability currents are studied. According to two ways of realizing the q -deformed Heisenberg algebra by the undeformed operators, the perturbation structures of two q -deformed probability currents are explored in detail. Locally the structures of two perturbation q -deformed probability currents are different, one is explicitly potential dependent; the other is not. But their total contributions to the whole space are the same.

PACS: 03. 65. -w 03. 65. ca

Keywords: q -deformed dynamics, currents, perturbation structures

§ E-mail address: jzzhang@ecust.edu.cn

jzzhang@physik.uni-kl.de

Recently the q -deformed quantum theory, as a possible modification of the ordinary quantum theory at extremely small space scale, say, much smaller than 10^{-18} cm, has obtained attention. In literature different frameworks of q -deformed quantum theories were established [1–21]. In order to establish a consistent framework in q -deformed quantum theories three delicate points must be considered: the construction of the simultaneous hermitian position and momentum operators; the establishment of the correspondence of the position and momentum operators to the q -deformed annihilation and creation operators; and the reduction of the q -deformed annihilation and creation operators to the undeformed ones. In the framework of the q -deformed Heisenberg algebra developed in Refs. [2, 4] the above three aspects are investigated in detail. This framework is self-consistent. New features, both in the uncertainty relations and dynamics, in this framework are explored. The q -deformed uncertainty relation essentially deviates from the Heisenberg one [14, 15, 17, 21]: Heisenberg’s minimal uncertainty relation is undercut. In a special q -deformed squeezed states a new critical phenomenon is explored[17]: at a critical point the variance of one component of a quadrature of light field approaches zero, but the variance of the conjugate component remains finite. Such critical phenomenon is forbidden by Heisenberg’s uncertainty relations, but allowed by the q -deformed uncertainty relations. In dynamics the non-perturbation energy spectrum of the q -deformed Schrödinger equation exhibits an exponential structure [3, 4, 16] with new degrees of freedom and new quantum numbers. Using such an exponential structure the spectrum of quark-lepton is explained [16]. In the perturbation aspects the q -deformed dynamics also exhibits a new feature: the perturbation expansion of the q -deformed Hamiltonian possesses complicated structures, which amount to additional momentum-dependent interactions [2, 4, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21]. Furthermore, corresponding to two ways of realizing the q -deformed operators by the undeformed ones there are two q -perturbation momentum-dependent Hamiltonians, one originates from the perturbation expansion of the potential in one configuration space, the other originates from the perturbation expansion of the kinetic energy in the other configuration space. At the level of operators, they are different. But they contribute the same shifts to the undeformed energy spectrum. [18, 19, 21].

In this paper the non-perturbation and perturbation structures of the q -deformed prob-

ability currents are investigated. The study of the perturbation q -deformed currents explores that the essential deviation of the q -deformed quantum mechanics from the ordinary quantum mechanics is in their *local* structure. The perturbation structures of the q -deformed probability currents in these two q -perturbation approaches are investigated in detail. In one approach the components of the q -deformed perturbation probability current possess different ranks, describing space derivatives of different order of the corresponding sub-current of different levels. Locally the structures of two perturbation q -deformed probability currents are different, one is explicitly potential dependent; the other is not. But their total contributions to the whole space are the same.

In the following we first review the background of the q -deformed dynamics. In terms of the q -deformed phase space variables — position and momentum operators X and P the following q -deformed Heisenberg algebra has been developed [2, 4]:

$$q^{1/2}XP - q^{-1/2}PX = iU, \quad UX = q^{-1}XU, \quad UP = qPU, \quad (1)$$

where X and P are hermitian and U is unitary: $X^\dagger = X$, $P^\dagger = P$, $U^\dagger = U^{-1}$. Compared to the Heisenberg algebra the operator U is a new member, called scaling operator. Necessity of introducing the operator U is as follows.

Simultaneous hermitian of X and P is a delicate point in the q -deformed dynamics. Definition of algebra (1) is based on definition of the hermitian momentum operator P . However, if X is assumed to be a hermitian operator in a Hilbert space the q -deformed derivative [4, 22]

$$\partial_X X = 1 + qX\partial_X, \quad (2)$$

which codes non-commutativity of space, shows that the usual quantization rule $P \rightarrow -i\partial_X$ does not yield a hermitian momentum operator. A hermitian momentum operator P is related to ∂_X and X in a nonlinear way by introducing a scaling operator U [4]

$$U^{-1} \equiv q^{1/2}[1 + (q-1)X\partial_X], \quad \bar{\partial}_X \equiv -q^{-1/2}U\partial_X, \quad P \equiv -\frac{i}{2}(\partial_X - \bar{\partial}_X), \quad (3)$$

where $\bar{\partial}_X$ is the conjugate of ∂_X . The operator U is introduced in the definition of the hermitian momentum, thus it closely relates to properties of dynamics and plays an essential role in the q -deformed quantum mechanics. Nontrivial properties of U imply that the

algebra (1) has a richer structure than the Heisenberg commutation relation. In Eq. (1) the parameter q is a fixed real number. It is important to make distinctions for different realizations of the q -algebra by different ranges of q values [23–25]. Following Refs. [2, 4] we only consider the case $q > 1$ in this paper. The reason is that such choice of the parameter q leads to consistent dynamics. In the limit $q \rightarrow 1^+$ the scaling operator U reduces to a unit operator, thus the algebra (1) reduces to the Heisenberg commutation relation.

Such defined hermitian momentum P leads to the q -deformation effects, which are exhibited by the dynamical equation. Eq. (3) shows that the momentum P depends non-linearly on X and ∂_X . Thus the q -deformed Schrödinger equation is difficult to treat. The perturbation treatment of the q -deformed Schrödinger equation is based on realizing the q -deformed operators X , P and U by undeformed variables. There are two pairs of undeformed variables [4].

(I) Variables $\hat{x}$, $\hat{p}$ of the ordinary quantum mechanics, where $\hat{x}$, $\hat{p}$ satisfy: $[\hat{x}, \hat{p}] = i$, $\hat{x} = \hat{x}^\dagger$, $\hat{p} = \hat{p}^\dagger$. The q -deformed operators X , P and U are related to $\hat{x}$, $\hat{p}$ by:

$$X = \frac{[\hat{z} + \frac{1}{2}]}{\hat{z} + \frac{1}{2}} \hat{x}, \quad P = \hat{p}, \quad U = q^{\hat{z}}, \quad (4)$$

where $\hat{z} = -\frac{i}{2}(\hat{x}\hat{p} + \hat{p}\hat{x})$ and $[A]$ is the q -deformation of A , defined by $[A] = (q^A - q^{-A})/(q - q^{-1})$. It is easy to check that such defined X , P and U satisfy Eq. (1).

(II) Variables $\tilde{x}$ and $\tilde{p}$ of an undeformed algebra, which are obtained by a transformation of $\hat{x}$ and $\hat{p}$:

$$\tilde{x} = \hat{x}F^{-1}(\hat{z}), \quad \tilde{p} = F(\hat{z})\hat{p}, \quad (5)$$

where

$$F^{-1}(\hat{z}) = \frac{[\hat{z} - \frac{1}{2}]}{\hat{z} - \frac{1}{2}}, \quad (6)$$

Such defined variables $\tilde{x}$ and $\tilde{p}$ also satisfy undeformed algebra: $[\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}] = i$, and $\tilde{x} = \tilde{x}^\dagger$, $\tilde{p} = \tilde{p}^\dagger$. Thus $\tilde{p} = -i\partial_{\tilde{x}}$. The operator $F^{-1}(\hat{z})$ is non-unitary: Using $[A]^\dagger = [A^\dagger]$, $[-A] = -[A]$, and $\hat{z}^\dagger = -\hat{z}$, we have

$$(F^{-1}(\hat{z}))^\dagger = F^{-1}(-\hat{z}) = \frac{[\hat{z} + \frac{1}{2}]}{\hat{z} + \frac{1}{2}}, \quad F^{-1}(\hat{z})(F^{-1}(\hat{z}))^\dagger \neq I.$$

Though the transformation $F^{-1}(\hat{z})$ maintains the commutation relation $[\hat{x}, \hat{p}]$, the essential point is that it does *not* maintain the inner product $\langle \psi | \phi \rangle$. It is not clear whether $F^{-1}(\hat{z})$

leads to the same physical consequences in the $(\hat{x}, \hat{p})$ system and the $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})$ system. A detailed study of perturbation aspects in these two systems is necessary. The q -deformed operators X , P and U are related to $\tilde{x}$ and $\tilde{p}$ as follows:

$$X = \tilde{x}, \quad P = F^{-1}(\tilde{z})\tilde{p}, \quad U = q^{\tilde{z}}, \quad \tilde{z} = -\frac{i}{2}(\tilde{x}\tilde{p} + \tilde{p}\tilde{x}) \quad (7)$$

with $F^{-1}(\tilde{z})$ defined by Eq. (6) for variables $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})$. From Eqs. (5)–(7) it follows that X , P and U satisfy Eq. (1). and Eq. (7) is equivalent to Eq. (4).

Now we first consider the non-perturbation probability current of the q -deformed dynamics.

The q -deformed phase space (X, P) governed by the q -algebra (1) is a q -deformation of the phase space $(\hat{x}, \hat{p})$ of the ordinary quantum mechanics, thus all the machinery of the ordinary quantum mechanics can be applied to the q -deformed quantum mechanics. It means that dynamical equations of a quantum system are the same for the undeformed operators and for the q -deformed operators (X, P) . That is, the time-dependent Schrödinger equation with the q -deformed Hamiltonian $H(X, P) = \frac{1}{2\mu}P^2 + V(X)$ is $i\partial_t\psi(X, t) = H(X, P)\psi(X, t)$. Using Eqs. (2) and (3), we rewrite P^2 as

$$P^2 = -\frac{1}{4}\partial_X(1 + \eta U + U^2)\partial_X, \quad (8)$$

where $\eta = (q^{1/2} + q^{-1/2})$, then it follows that the q -deformed continuity equation of the probability conservation reads

$$\partial_t\rho(X, t) + \partial_X j_q(X, t) = S_q(X, t),$$

where the position probability density $\rho(X, t) = \psi^*(X, t)\psi(X, t)$; the q -deformed probability current density is

$$j_q(X, t) = -\frac{i}{8\mu}\left\{[(1 + \eta U + U^2)(\partial_X\psi(X, t))_q]\psi^*(X, t) - [(1 + \eta U + U^2)(\partial_X\psi(X, t))^*_q]\psi(X, t)\right\}. \quad (9)$$

Because of Eq. (8) the second term in Eq. (9) is written as

$[(1 + \eta U + U^2)(\partial_X\psi(X, t))_q]^*\psi(X, t)$, not as $(1 + \eta U + U^2)(\partial_X\psi(X, t))^*_q\psi(X, t)$. In the above $(\partial_X\psi(X, t))_q$ is the q -deformed partial

derivative with the bracket.¹ When $q \rightarrow 1^+$, the scaling operator U reduces to the unit operator, thus the q -deformed current term j_q reduces to the ordinary probability current density $j_{un}(X, t) = -\frac{i}{2\mu} \{ \psi^*(X, t) \partial_X \psi(X, t) - [\partial_X \psi^*(X, t)] \psi(X, t) \}$.

In the above S_q is the q -deformed source term,

$$S_q(X, t) = -\frac{i}{8\mu} \left\{ [(1 + \eta U + U^2)(\partial_X \psi(qX, t))]_q (\partial_X \psi^*(X, t))_q - [(1 + \eta U + U^2)(\partial_X \psi(qX, t))]_q^* (\partial_X \psi(X, t))_q \right\}. \quad (10)$$

Similar to Eq. (9) the second term in Eq. (10) is written as

$[(1 + \eta U + U^2)(\partial_X \psi(qX, t))]_q^* (\partial_X \psi(X, t))_q$, not as $(1 + \eta U + U^2)(\partial_X \psi(qX, t))_q^* (\partial_X \psi(X, t))_q$. The local conservation of the probability requires that the source term S_q should vanish. This inference can be drawn from the following considerations. It is noticed that when $q \rightarrow 1^+$, in Eq. (10) the first term $[(1 + \eta U + U^2)(\partial_X \psi(qX, t))]_q (\partial_X \psi^*(X, t))_q$ reduces to a real quantity $4(\partial_X \psi(X, t))(\partial_X \psi^*(X, t))$. The same conclusion holds for the second term in Eq. (10). The q dependent operator U is

¹From Eq. (2) of the q -derivative it follows that

$$\partial_X X^n = q^n X^n \partial_X + (\partial_X X^n)_q,$$

where the q -deformed partial derivative $(\partial_X X^n)_q$ with the bracket is defined as

$$(\partial_X X^n)_q \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} q^k X^{n-1-k} = \frac{q^n - 1}{q - 1} X^{n-1}.$$

The q -deformed partial derivative for function $f(x)$, which has well defined Tailor expansion, reads

$$\partial_X f(X) = f(qX) \partial_X + (\partial_X f(X))_q,$$

Notice that in the first term the variable of the function f is qX . where the q -deformed partial derivative $(\partial_X f(X))_q$ with the bracket is defined as

$$(\partial_X f(X))_q \equiv \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{f^{(k)}(0)}{k!} (\partial_X X^k)_q.$$

When $q \rightarrow 1^+$ the q -deformed partial derivative with the bracket reduces to undeformed one, $(\partial_X X^n)_q \rightarrow nX^{n-1}$ and $(\partial_X f(X))_q \rightarrow f'(X)$. The q -deformed Leibniz rule for $f(X)g(X)$ is

$$\partial_X (f(X)g(X)) = (\partial_X f(X))_q g(X) + f(qX) (\partial_X g(X))_q.$$

Notice again that in the second term the variable of the function f is qX . This leads to a involved structure of the q -deformed current.

introduced in the definition of the hermitian momentum P . For any value of the parameter q the momentum P should maintain the same physical property. This requires that for any value of the parameter q the operator U should be singularity free and maintain the same analytical property. Therefore a continuous variation of the parameter q does not change the real properties of the two terms in Eq. (10), the two terms exactly cancel each other which leads to $S_q = 0$.

Now we discuss the perturbation q -deformed probability currents.

If the q -deformed quantum mechanics is a realistic physical theory at short distances much smaller than 10^{-18} cm, its correction to the ordinary quantum mechanics must be extremely small in the energy range of nowadays experiments. This means that the parameter q must be extremely close to one, the perturbation investigation of the q -deformed dynamics is meaningful. So we can let $q = e^f = 1 + f + f^2$ with $0 < f \ll 1$ and it is accurate enough in the perturbation expansion to the order f^2 .

In the $(\hat{x}, \hat{p})$ system from Eq. (4) it follows that X is represented as a non-linear function of $(\hat{x}, \hat{p})$:

$$X = i(q - q^{-1})^{-1}(q^{(\hat{z}+1/2)} - q^{-(\hat{z}+1/2)})\hat{p}^{-1}. \quad (11)$$

Using Eq. (11), to the order f^2 , the perturbation expansion of X reads

$$X = \hat{x} + f^2 g(\hat{x}, \hat{p}), \quad g(\hat{x}, \hat{p}) = -\frac{1}{6}(1 + \hat{x}\hat{p}\hat{x}\hat{p})\hat{x}. \quad (12)$$

For regular potentials $V(X)$ which are singularity free, to the order f^2 in the perturbation expansion, such potentials can be expressed by the undeformed variables $(\hat{x}, \hat{p})$ as

$$V(X) = V(\hat{x}) + \hat{H}_I^{(q)}(\hat{x}, \hat{p}), \quad (13)$$

where the perturbation Hamiltonian is

$$\hat{H}_I^{(q)}(\hat{x}, \hat{p}) = \frac{f^2}{6} \{ \hat{x}^3 V'(\hat{x}) \partial_{\hat{x}}^2 + [\hat{x}^3 V''(\hat{x}) + 3\hat{x}^2 V'(\hat{x})] \partial_{\hat{x}} + \frac{1}{3} \hat{x}^3 V'''(\hat{x}) + \frac{3}{2} \hat{x}^2 V''(\hat{x}) \}. \quad (14)$$

In the $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})$ system using Eq. (7) the perturbation expansions of the momentum P and the kinetic energy $P^2/(2\mu)$, to the order f^2 , read

$$P = \tilde{p} + f^2 h(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}), \quad h(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}) = -\frac{1}{6}(1 + \tilde{p}\tilde{x}\tilde{p}\tilde{x})\tilde{p}, \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{1}{2\mu}P^2 = \frac{1}{2\mu}\tilde{p}^2 + \tilde{H}_I^{(q)}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}), \quad (16)$$

where the perturbation Hamiltonian is

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_I^{(q)}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}) &= \frac{1}{2\mu}f^2[\tilde{p}h(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}) + h(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})\tilde{p}] \\ &= -\frac{1}{12\mu}f^2[2\tilde{x}^2\partial_{\tilde{x}}^4 + 8\tilde{x}\partial_{\tilde{x}}^3 + 3\partial_{\tilde{x}}^2] \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

From Eqs. (13), (14), (16) and (17), it follows that the perturbation expansion of the q -deformed Hamiltonian $H(X, P)$ can be written down in the $(\hat{x}, \hat{p})$ system or the $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})$ system. In the $(\hat{x}, \hat{p})$ system we have

$$H(X(\hat{x}, \hat{p}), P(\hat{x}, \hat{p})) = H_{\text{un}}(\hat{x}, \hat{p}) + \hat{H}_I^{(q)}(\hat{x}, \hat{p}); \quad (18)$$

in the $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})$ system we have

$$H(X(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}), P(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})) = H_{\text{un}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}) + \tilde{H}_I^{(q)}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}). \quad (19)$$

In the above

$$H_{\text{un}}(\xi, \kappa) = \frac{1}{2\mu}\kappa^2 + V(\xi) \quad (20)$$

is the corresponding undeformed Hamiltonian in the (ξ, κ) system, where (ξ, κ) represents $(\hat{x}, \hat{p})$ or $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})$.

Eqs. (14) and (17) show that the above two perturbation Hamiltonians $\hat{H}_I^{(q)}(\hat{x}, \hat{p})$ and $\tilde{H}_I^{(q)}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})$ originate, separately, from the perturbation expansions of the potential and the kinetic energy. At the level of operator they are different.

In the $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})$ system, to the order f^2 , from the q -deformed Schrödinger equation with the Hamiltonians (19), (20) and (17) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t [\psi^*(\tilde{x}, t)\psi(\tilde{x}, t)] &= \psi^*(\tilde{x}, t) \left[H_{\text{un}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}) + \tilde{H}_I^{(q)}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}) \right] \psi(\tilde{x}, t) \\ &\quad - \left\{ \left[H_{\text{un}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}) + \tilde{H}_I^{(q)}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}) \right] \psi^*(\tilde{x}, t) \right\} \psi(\tilde{x}, t). \end{aligned}$$

The terms with $H_{\text{un}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})$ lead to the undeformed current $j_{\text{un}}(\tilde{x}, t) = -\frac{i}{2\mu}\{\psi^*(\tilde{x}, t)\partial_{\tilde{x}}\psi(\tilde{x}, t) - [\partial_{\tilde{x}}\psi^*(\tilde{x}, t)]\psi(\tilde{x}, t)\}$ in the $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})$ system. The terms with $\tilde{H}_I^{(q)}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})$ lead to the perturbation contribution of the q -deformed current. The perturbation structure of the q -deformed

current is involved. As an example, we show the perturbation structure contributed by the term $\tilde{x}^2\partial_{\tilde{x}}^4$ in Eq. (17) in detail.

$$-\frac{i}{12\mu}\{\psi^*(\tilde{x},t)2\tilde{x}^2\partial_{\tilde{x}}^4\psi(\tilde{x},t)-2[\tilde{x}^2\partial_{\tilde{x}}^4\psi^*(\tilde{x},t)]\psi(\tilde{x},t)\} = \\ \partial_{\tilde{x}}[2j_{q2}(\tilde{x},t)-12j_{q1}(\tilde{x},t)-4j_{q0}(\tilde{x},t)+2j_{\text{un}}(\tilde{x},t)]+8\tilde{s}_{q1}^{(2)}(\tilde{x},t),$$

where

$$j_{q0}(\tilde{x},t)=\mathcal{J}_{q0}=-\frac{i}{12\mu}\{[\partial_{\tilde{x}}\psi^*(\tilde{x},t)]\tilde{x}^2\partial_{\tilde{x}}^2\psi(\tilde{x},t)-[\partial_{\tilde{x}}^2\psi^*(\tilde{x},t)]\tilde{x}^2\partial_{\tilde{x}}\psi(\tilde{x},t)\}. \quad (21)$$

$$j_{q1}(\tilde{x},t)=\partial_{\tilde{x}}\mathcal{J}_{q1}, \quad \mathcal{J}_{q1}=-\frac{i}{12\mu}\{\psi^*(\tilde{x},t)\tilde{x}\partial_{\tilde{x}}\psi(\tilde{x},t)-[\partial_{\tilde{x}}\psi^*(\tilde{x},t)]\tilde{x}\psi(\tilde{x},t)\}. \quad (22)$$

$$j_{q2}(\tilde{x},t)=\partial_{\tilde{x}}^2\mathcal{J}_{q2}, \quad \mathcal{J}_{q2}=-\frac{i}{12\mu}\{\psi^*(\tilde{x},t)\tilde{x}^2\partial_{\tilde{x}}\psi(\tilde{x},t)-[\partial_{\tilde{x}}\psi^*(\tilde{x},t)]\tilde{x}^2\psi(\tilde{x},t)\}. \quad (23)$$

$$\tilde{s}_{q1}^{(2)}(\tilde{x},t)=-\frac{i}{12\mu}\{[\partial_{\tilde{x}}\psi^*(\tilde{x},t)]\tilde{x}\partial_{\tilde{x}}^2\psi(\tilde{x},t)-[\partial_{\tilde{x}}^2\psi^*(\tilde{x},t)]\tilde{x}\partial_{\tilde{x}}\psi(\tilde{x},t)\}. \quad (24)$$

In the above $\tilde{s}_{q1}^{(2)}(\tilde{x},t)$ is the q -deformed probability source from the terms $\tilde{x}^2\partial_{\tilde{x}}^4$. Summing the total contributions of $\tilde{H}_I^{(q)}(\tilde{x},\tilde{p})$, we find that the contributions to $\tilde{s}_q^{(2)}$ from the terms $\tilde{x}^2\partial_{\tilde{x}}^4$ and $\tilde{x}\partial_{\tilde{x}}^3$ in Eq. (17) exactly cancel each other. Thus the q -deformed continuity equation of the probability conservation is

$$\partial_t\rho(\tilde{x},t)+\partial_{\tilde{x}}[j_{\text{un}}(\tilde{x},t)+f^2\tilde{j}_q^{(2)}(\tilde{x},t)]=0$$

where the perturbation q -deformed current $\tilde{j}_q^{(2)}(\tilde{x},t)$ is

$$\tilde{j}_q^{(2)}(\tilde{x},t)=2j_{q2}(\tilde{x},t)-4j_{q1}(\tilde{x},t)-4j_{q0}(\tilde{x},t)-\frac{1}{6}j_{\text{un}}(\tilde{x},t). \quad (25)$$

The perturbation q -deformed current $\tilde{j}_q^{(2)}$ possesses different components j_{qi} . A current is called the basic current if it is not a space derivative of another current. The currents $j_{\text{un}}, j_{q0}=\mathcal{J}_{q0}, \mathcal{J}_{q1}, \mathcal{J}_{q2}$ are the basic current. A current is called the composed current with i 's sub-currents if it is space derivatives of i order of a basic current. The currents j_{q1}

is a composed current with one sub-current $\mathcal{J}_{q0}$. The composed current j_{q2} includes two sub-currents: the current $\mathcal{J}_{q2}$ and the effective sub-current $\mathcal{J}_{q1}^{eff} \equiv \partial_{\tilde{x}} \mathcal{J}_{q2}$. Thus j_{q2} can be written as $j_{q2} = \partial_{\tilde{x}}^2 \mathcal{J}_{q2}$ or $j_{q2} = \partial_{\tilde{x}} \mathcal{J}_{q1}^{eff}$. The currents j_{q2} , $\mathcal{J}_{q1}^{eff}$ and $\mathcal{J}_{q2}$ are at different levels: the basic current $\mathcal{J}_{q2}$ is at the deepest level because it has not a substructure; j_{q2} is at the highest level because it has two substructures. The index i in j_{qi} is called "rank" i , i.e. the "rank" refers to the number of the sub-currents included in j_{qi} .

In the $(\hat{x}, \hat{p})$ system from Eqs. (18), (20) and (14), to the order f^2 , the corresponding perturbation q -deformed current $\hat{j}_q^{(2)}(\hat{x}, t)$ is

$$\hat{j}_q^{(2)}(\hat{x}, t) = i \frac{f^2}{6} \left\{ \psi^*(\hat{x}, t) \hat{x}^3 V'(\hat{x}) \partial_{\hat{x}} \psi(\hat{x}, t) - [\partial_{\hat{x}} \psi^*(\hat{x}, t)] \hat{x}^3 V'(\hat{x}) \psi(\hat{x}, t) \right\}. \quad (26)$$

Locally the structures of $\hat{j}_q^{(2)}(\hat{x}, t)$ and $\tilde{j}_q^{(2)}(\tilde{x}, t)$ are different. The current $\hat{j}_q^{(2)}(\hat{x}, t)$ is explicitly potential dependent. But the potential is not explicitly included in the current $\tilde{j}_q^{(2)}(\tilde{x}, t)$. Because the wave function $\psi(\tilde{x}, t)$ is potential dependent, the current $\tilde{j}_q^{(2)}(\tilde{x}, t)$ is implicitly potential dependent.

A question arises: whether the two currents $\hat{j}_q^{(2)}(\hat{x}, t)$ and $\tilde{j}_q^{(2)}(\tilde{x}, t)$ globally lead to the same result in physics? The question is answered by the following theorem.

Perturbation Equivalence Theorem of q -Deformed Currents The total contributions of the two currents $\hat{j}_q^{(2)}(\hat{x}, t)$ and $\tilde{j}_q^{(2)}(\tilde{x}, t)$ to the whole space are the same.

First we notice that for the eigenstate $|\psi_n^{(0)}\rangle$ of the undeformed Hamiltonian H_{un} , $H_{\text{un}}|\psi_n^{(0)}\rangle = E_n^{(\text{un})}|\psi_n^{(0)}\rangle$, it is natural to assume that the structure of the undeformed wave function $\psi_n^{(0)}(\hat{x}_0) = \langle \hat{x}_0 | \psi_n^{(0)} \rangle$ in the configuration space $\hat{x}_0$ and the structure of the undeformed wave function $\psi_n^{(0)}(\tilde{x}_0) = \langle \tilde{x}_0 | \psi_n^{(0)} \rangle$ in the configuration space $\tilde{x}_0$ are the same.

Now the demonstration of the equivalence theorem is simple. Integrating $\hat{j}_q^{(2)}(\hat{x}, t)$ and $\tilde{j}_q^{(2)}(\tilde{x}, t)$, respectively, in configuration spaces $\hat{x}_0$ and $\tilde{x}_0$ we obtain their total contributions to the whole space (for our purpose common numerical factor is not important)

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{j}_q^{(2)} &= \int d\hat{x}_0 \hat{j}_q^{(2)}(\hat{x}_0, t) \\ &\sim \int d\hat{x}_0 [\psi_n^{(0)*}(\hat{x}_0) \hat{x}_0^3 V' \partial_{\hat{x}_0} \psi_n^{(0)}(\hat{x}_0) - (\partial_{\hat{x}_0} \psi_n^{(0)*}(\hat{x}_0)) \hat{x}_0^3 V' \psi_n^{(0)}(\hat{x}_0)] \\ &\sim \int d\hat{x}_0 \psi_n^{(0)*}(\hat{x}_0) [2i \hat{x}_0^3 V' \hat{p} + 3 \hat{x}_0^2 V' + \hat{x}_0^3 V''] \psi_n^{(0)}(\hat{x}_0) \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{J}_q^{(2)} &= \int d\tilde{x}_0 \tilde{j}_q^{(2)}(\tilde{x}_0, t) = \int d\tilde{x}_0 \left[-4(\tilde{j}_{q0}^{(2)}(\tilde{x}_0, t) - \frac{1}{6}j_{un}^{(2)}(\tilde{x}_0, t)) \right] \\
&\sim \int d\tilde{x}_0 \left[-4((\partial_{\tilde{x}_0} \psi_n^{(0)*}(\tilde{x}_0)) \tilde{x}_0^2 \partial_{\tilde{x}_0}^2 \psi_n^{(0)}(\tilde{x}_0) - (\partial_{\tilde{x}_0}^2 \psi_n^{(0)*}(\tilde{x}_0)) \tilde{x}_0^2 \partial_{\tilde{x}_0} \psi_n^{(0)}(\tilde{x}_0)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - (\psi_n^{(0)*}(\tilde{x}_0) \partial_{\tilde{x}_0} \psi_n^{(0)}(\tilde{x}_0) - (\partial_{\tilde{x}_0} \psi_n^{(0)*}(\tilde{x}_0)) \psi_n^{(0)}(\tilde{x}_0)) \right] \\
&\sim \int d\tilde{x}_0 \psi_n^{(0)*}(\tilde{x}_0) [2i\tilde{x}_0^2 \tilde{p}^3 + 6\tilde{x}_0 p^2 - 2i\tilde{p}] \psi_n^{(0)}(\tilde{x}_0)
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

In the undeformed stationary state $|\tilde{\psi}^{(0)}\rangle$ we have

$$i \frac{d}{dt} \langle \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} | \tilde{x}^m \tilde{p}^n | \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} \rangle = \langle \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} | \left[\tilde{x}^m \tilde{p}^n, \frac{1}{2\mu} \tilde{p}^2 + V(\tilde{x}) \right] | \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} \rangle = 0. \tag{29}$$

Using Eq. (29) and considering the cases of $(m=3, n=2)$, $(m=2, n=1)$, and $(m=1, n=0)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\mu} \langle \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} | \tilde{x}^2 \tilde{p}^3 | \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} \rangle = \frac{i}{\mu} \langle \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} | \tilde{x} \tilde{p}^2 | \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} \rangle + \frac{2}{3} \langle \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} | \tilde{x}^3 V' \tilde{p} | \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} \rangle - \frac{i}{3} \langle \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} | \tilde{x}^3 V'' | \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} \rangle,$$

$$\frac{1}{\mu} \langle \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} | \tilde{x} \tilde{p}^2 | \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} | \tilde{x}^2 V' | \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} \rangle$$

$$\langle \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} | \tilde{p} | \tilde{\psi}^{(0)} \rangle = 0$$

Putting these three equations in Eq. (28), shows that the integral of Eq. (28) is just the integral of Eq. (27).

Furthermore, it is clarified that the time evolution of the q -deformed dynamics and the perturbation shifts of the energy spectrum are the same in the $(\hat{x}, \hat{p})$ system and the $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})$ system [19]. We conclude that the $(\hat{x}, \hat{p})$ system and the $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})$ system are equivalent in describing the q -deformed dynamics.

In the ordinary quantum theory, there is only a trivial transformation of canonical variables (x, p) which remains commutation relations. But unlike the ordinary quantum theory, in the q -deformed quantum theory there is a non-trivial transformation among two pairs of the undeformed variables which remains the commutation relations. The operator $F^{-1}(\hat{z})$ defined by Eq. (6) is non-unitary. It is a variable transformation between two undeformed variables $(\hat{x}, \hat{p})$ and $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})$; it should be distinguished from a unitary transformation

in a Hilbert space. Thus it is not clear whether two perturbation formulations in the $(\hat{x}, \hat{p})$ system and the $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p})$ system are equivalent. It is interesting to clarify that though locally the structures of two q -deformed perturbation probability currents are different, but their total contributions to the whole space are the same.

The structures of the perturbation q -deformed currents show that the essential deviation of the q -deformed quantum mechanics from the ordinary quantum mechanics is in their *local* structure. Further exploration of novel local properties in the q -deformed quantum mechanics is promising.

This work has been supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (Germany). The author would like to thank W. Rühl for helpful discussions. His work has also been supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under the grant number 10074014 and by the Shanghai Education Development Foundation.

References

- [1] J. Schwenk and J. Wess, Phys. Lett. **B291** (1992) 273.
- [2] A. Hebecker, S. Schreckenberger, J. Schwenk, W. Weich and J. Wess, Z. Phys. **C64** (1994) 355.
- [3] A. Lorek and J. Wess, Z. Phys. **C67** (1995) 671 [q-alg/9502007].
- [4] M. Fichtmüller, A. Lorek and J. Wess, Z. Phys. **C71** (1996) 533 [hep-th/9511106].
- [5] A. Lorek, A. Ruffing and J. Wess, Z. Phys. **C74** (1997) 369 [hep-th/9605161].
- [6] B. L. Cerchiai, R. Hinterding, J. Madore and J. Wess, Eur. Phys. J. **C8** (1999) 547 [math.qa/9809160].
- [7] A. J. Macfarlane, SU(2)-Q,” J. Phys. **A22** (1989) 4581.
- [8] L. C. Biedenharn, J. Phys. **A22** (1989) L873.

- [9] C.-P. Sun and H. Fu, Representation,” J. Phys. **A22** (1989) L983; M. Chaichian and P. Kulish, Phys. Lett. **B234** (1990) 72; P.P. Kulish and E.V. Damashinsky, J. Phys. A23 (1990) L415; M. Arik and D. D. Coon, J. Math. Phys. **17** (1976) 524.
- [10] S. Codriansky, Phys. Lett. A184 (1993) 381.
- [11] A. Kempf, symmetry,” J. Math. Phys. **35** (1994) 4483 [hep-th/9311147].
- [12] R.J. McDermott and A.I. Solomon, J. Phys. A 27 (1994) L15.
- [13] C.A. Nelson and M.H. Fields, Phys. Rev. A51 (1995) 2410.
- [14] Jian-zu Zhang, Phys. Lett. B440 (1998) 66.
- [15] Jian-zu Zhang, Phys. Lett. A262 (1999) 125;
- [16] Jian-zu Zhang, Phys. Lett. **B477** (2000) 361; Chin. Phys. Lett. **17** (2000) 91.
- [17] P. Osland and Jian-zu Zhang, Ann.Phys. (N. Y.) **C290** (2001) 45 [hep-th/0010176].
- [18] Jian-zu Zhang and P. Osland, Euro. Phys. J. **C20** (2001) 393 [hep-th/0102014].
- [19] Jian-zu Zhang, Phys. Lett. **B517** (2001) 210 [hep-th/0108111].
- [20] Jian-zu Zhang, Phys. Lett. **B539** (2001) 162 [hep-th/0205125].
- [21] Jian-zu Zhang, Euro. Phys. J. (in press) [hep-th/0211051].
- [22] J. Wess and B. Zumino, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **18B** (1991) 302.
- [23] C. Zachos, Contem. Math. 134 (1992) 351.
- [24] C. A. Nelson and M. G. Gartley, J. Phys. **A27** (1994) 3857.
- [25] A. I. Solomon and J. Katriel, J. Phys. A26 (1993) 5443.